

Appl. No. 10/786,341  
Examiner: PATEL, NITIN, Art Unit 2629  
In response to the Office Action dated December 12, 2006

Date: March 2, 2007  
Attorney Docket No. 10113821

## **REMARKS**

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on December 12, 2006 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### Present Status of Application

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chiang et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0103359, hereinafter "Chiang").

In this paper, claims 11-14 are canceled without prejudice. Claim 1 is amended to recite the limitations of original claims 13-14. Thus, on entry of this amendment, claims 1-10 and 15-17 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chiang. To the extent that the grounds of the rejections may be applied to the claims now pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

The rejection of a claim for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that the prior art reference include every element of the rejected claim. Furthermore, as stated by the Federal Circuit, the prior art reference must disclose each element of the claimed invention "arranged as in the claim." *Lindermann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The rejections of original claims 13-14 are insufficient, insofar as they do not comply with the requirements of MPEP 707.07 et seq., which requires that all rejections be stated with completeness and clarity.

MPEP 707.07(d) requires that the grounds of a rejection be “fully and clearly stated.” The office action fails to meet this requirement in the present application in connection with original claims 13-14, the limitations of which are now incorporated in claim 1.

In the rejections, the Examiner refers to Figs. 3-4 of Chiang to teach the limitations of original claims 13-14. However, the office action fails to identify any structure in Figs. 3-4 that the Examiner alleges to be a circuit board disposed under the base plate, or showing that the light-emitting element is attached to the circuit board to acquire power. Furthermore, with reference to the figures, Applicant submits that there is in fact no disclosure of a circuit board disposed under the base plate, wherein the light-emitting element is attached to the circuit board to acquire power.

As the office action fails to state with completeness and clarity any teaching or suggestion of at least the limitations noted above, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 13-14 (now claim 1) should be withdrawn. Should an ensuing office action be mailed which provides new grounds for the rejection of the claims, such an ensuing office action should be made non-final. MPEP 706.07(a).

Chiang fails to teach or suggest a keyboard structure comprising a circuit board disposed under the base plate and the light-emitting element is attached to the circuit board to acquire power, as recited in claim 1.

In the rejections, the Examiner relies on the disclosure in Figs. 4a, 4b of Chiang to teach the limitations of claim 1. However, as amended, claim 1 recites that the keyboard structure comprises a circuit board disposed under the base plate and the light-emitting element is attached to the circuit board to acquire power. As noted above, Chiang contains no disclosure

Appl. No. 10/786,341  
Examiner: PATEL, NITIN, Art Unit 2629  
In response to the Office Action dated December 12, 2006

Date: March 2, 2007  
Attorney Docket No. 10113821

of a circuit board disposed under the base plate. Furthermore, Chiang does not teach or suggest that the light-emitting element is attached to the circuit board to acquire power.

For at least the reasons described above, it is Applicant's belief that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and the claim passed to issue. Insofar as claims 2-10 and 15-17 depend from claim 1 either directly or indirectly, and therefore incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

#### Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. **502447**. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to Deposit Account No. **502447**.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nelson A. Quintero/

Nelson A. Quintero  
Reg. No. 52,143  
Customer No. 34,283  
Telephone: (310) 909-8535

P123497NAQ